



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ridge of the nose and swaying the palm from side to side to represent the elephant's trunk, or by a combination of these. Clearly the easiest of all the symbols to make was the cry. Furthermore, the cry alone could be used in the dark or when the recipient of the communication was behind a tree or a bush. Finally, the cry alone left arms and legs free for another occupation. So sounds were again and again preferred to gestures, and presently sounds began to be substituted for gestures, where these had at first been the sole symbols in use. Thus many thousands of years ago it became possible to express as much without gestures as with them; communication came to be speech with a varying amount of assistance from gesture and facial expression.

This we may characterize as the last step essential to the origin of language, although human speech was still very unlike anything we know to-day. Many sentences were as incapable of syntactic analysis as an infant's wail or an adult's 'ouch', 'damn', etc. Some expressions incapable of analysis were probably very long, for example, groans of agony, love-songs, hymns of triumph (the last two, of course, consisting of sounds in themselves as meaningless as *tra-la-la*). Some very long expressions could probably be combined with other linguistic elements; they functioned as words, not merely as sentences.

Emotions were the chief burden of conversation. They are still the most interesting part of human life and talk, and the majority of mankind dilute them with relatively little else. Undoubtedly perceptual thinking and talking were slow to grow, since they have not yet become customary for all men.

There was probably a great deal of meaningless variation in speech. Even now our interjections and imitative sounds vary in form without corresponding difference in meaning; it matters little whether I say 'ow' or 'ouch', 'bang' or 'bing', 'ting-a-ling' or 'ting-a-ling'.

Several other differences of a somewhat more intricate character might be specified, but these are enough to suggest the limitation and the uncouthness of the earliest speech. Such a jargon could, however, change and grow precisely as historical languages are observed to grow. From some such source, we may suppose, the languages of the present have gradually developed. But that is another story.

EDGEWATER, N. J.

E. H. STURTEVANT

REVIEWS

The Esthetic Basis of Greek Art. Bryn Mawr Notes and Monographs I. By Rhys Carpenter. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co. (1921). Pp. viii + 263.

The investigation of the esthetics of Greek art is not an untrodden field, yet few, if any, have left imprints within this field which are admitted to be those of authority. Professor Carpenter's book is a welcome contribution, and written with a singleness of purpose which is especially rare in works of this sort. For

he not only says that he does not attempt to deal with matters of taste, but, what is more, he does not attempt it, confining himself to an analysis of the behavior of Greek art.

A paragraph early in Chapter I serves to show the general point of view from which he proceeds (page 5).

And therein, it would seem, lies much of the characteristic behavior of Greek art—in rethinking certain essential matters of structure, purpose, and fitness, and in reembodying them in a fusion of geometric form with pictorial illusion.

Apocryphal of modern art Professor Carpenter's emphatic presentation of the necessity of a representational content (29-51), without which art is not intelligible because the so-called pure forms are not brought to an emotional focus, leads one to wish that more would read and learn than will.

His analysis is made from the viewpoint of spatial representation, that is, he classifies the arts as they offer a one-, two-, or three-dimensional appeal to our consciousness.

We already owe to Professor Carpenter a great debt for his clever and penetrating criticism of Mr. Hambidge's theory of Dynamic Symmetry¹, but, while his book in general is an exceptionally lucid treatment of an obscure subject, there are occasions when he, too, seems to have been misled by the fascination of his theory, and to have strained a point for the theory's sake.

His exposition of a one-dimensional appeal may be a case in point. True, he is careful to call it (57) "a presentation with one-dimensional emphasis", but he hardly makes clear the distinction between this and a two-dimensional appeal. After all, a two-dimensional presentation does not depend necessarily upon an emphasis of area.

After stating the sculptor's fundamental problem (81), Professor Carpenter gives the three principal means of solution—intelligible pose, planes of composition, and modelling lines (82-90). His treatment of the first of these, a nearly equivalent expression for which is "expressive contour", is excellent, particularly as regards the torsion of the horizontal axes. So, too, is his definition of the purpose of the modelling lines (93-97), lines "whose curvature lay in the plane of the visible dimension in order to suggest a curvature in the invisible dimension".

His discussion of that very relative and unreliable term Idealism is more difficult (113), for he says ". . . these idealizing tendencies . . . are, in their origin, almost accidental inheritances from the primitive and archaic periods". Are we really to infer from this that the idealism of the Greeks was accidental? Again, a little later, he seems to claim that the idealism of Pheidias arose from the intellectualized images of the body's parts (134). True, if such intellectualization has its origin in the Greeks' insistence upon thinking and seeing types, and things as departures from types;

¹For a brief (favorable) review of Mr. Hambidge's book, by Dr. T. L. Shear, see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, 15-62. For Professor Carpenter's discussion of the theory see American Journal of Archaeology 25 (1921), 18-36.

but how many will agree if by this is meant an intellectualization which is an almost accidental inheritance?

The fourth and last chapter (153-256) is devoted to architecture, and here much discussion will be provoked. For, if I understand Professor Carpenter's theory, he believes that the appeal of Greek architecture is a two-dimensional and not a three-dimensional one. His remarks upon number and commensurability are very interesting, but they lead him to say (205) that "commensurability. . . and rhythm. . . are only effective upon the spectator if the matter in which they are embodied is seen as in one and the same plane". Assuming this, must we go on and believe (206) that Greek architecture was "an architecture of planes rather than solids", and (209) that ". . . it can only *define or bound solid space, and cannot enclose it*"²? Doubtless the Greeks made no great contribution to the art of enclosing space, but, as a fact, can we apprehend their architecture in two dimensions? Must it be compared to a Jesuit façade? Must it share the author's criticism of modern architects for their paper flatness (107), or is this flatness of much greater degree and is the two-dimensional aspect of Greek architecture only a question of emphasis?

After all, Anthemios and Isodoros were Greeks and, I suppose, belonged to that East Mediterranean people (215) who lived "in a *much less three-dimensional world*³ than the North Europeans". And, finally, would our apprehension of the mass of a Doric entablature, adequately carried by the colonnade, exist without a lively apprehension of the third dimension? Surely Professor Carpenter cannot have expressed himself so as to be clearly understood, for, in another place (220), he says, of Greek architecture, "as in Greek relief, the third dimension is not suppressed, but abbreviated".

Finally, it is to be hoped that this first volume of the Bryn Mawr Notes and Monographs is to be followed by others of equal value, published in the same attractive form. In this connection, I should like to offer a suggestion, that the notes be numbered continuously from beginning to end of the book, that the reader may avoid the constant reference to the Index, to discover in what chapter the page being read belongs, in order to locate the note in question at the back of the book.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

BUTLER MURRAY

The Legacy of Greece. Edited by R. W. Livingstone: Oxford: at the Clarendon Press (1921). Pp. xi¹ + 424.

The contents of this volume are as follows:

The Value of Greece to the Future of the World, Gilbert Murray (1-23); Religion, W. R. Inge (25-56); Philosophy, J. Burnet (57-95); Mathematics and Astronomy, T. L. Heath (97-136); Natural Science, D'Arcy W. Thompson (137-162); Biology, Charles Singer (163-200); Medicine, Charles Singer (201-248); Literature, R. W. Livingstone (249-287); History, Arnold Toynbee (289-320); Political Thought,

A. E. Zimmern (321-352); The Lamps of Greek Art, Percy Gardner (353-396); Architecture, Reginald Blomfield (397-424).

It is a notable array of names that Mr. Livingstone has enlisted in the service of this endeavor to present in one volume what Germany and America have undertaken to set forth in two ambitious series, *Das Erbe der Alten*, and *Our Debt to the Classics*.

Whatever else these essays may be, they are all literary compositions, all readable. They seem to have been written on another planet and for another race of readers than that which can produce and digest the triple sawdust (as I once characterized its predecessor) of Stemplinger's *Horaz im Urteil der Jahrhunderte* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 2.67-68). Such unity as the collection possesses is due to the direction imparted by Professor Murray's introductory essay on *The Value of Greece to the Future of the World*. Professor Murray restates, with his unfailing charm, some of the conventional topics about the Greek genius and its significance for us, and especially stresses the idea that the qualities that make contact with the Greek mind so stimulating and so salutary to us reveal themselves in other fields than mere literature—in the art of course, but also in the science, the textbooks, the speculative and the practical philosophies of the Greeks.

For these reasons, and also perhaps to avoid competition with the Oxford volume of 1912 on *English Literature and the Classics* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 8.125-127), literature in this volume is confined to the one generalizing chapter (249-287) in which the editor eloquently restates some of the leading ideas of his book on the Greek genius—the simplicity, the perfection of form, the truth and the beauty of Greek literature (*THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 6.132-134). To these commonplaces, expressed in no commonplace fashion, he adds two interesting considerations: (1) Greek literature, unlike the French and the English literature of the past hundred and fifty years, was not a succession of reactions between the opposite extremes of realism and romanticism, but an orderly progression and development; (2) the imitation of the Greeks does not, like the imitation of recent moderns, impair individuality. The English poets who owe most to Greece—Milton, Grey, Shelley, Keats, Landor, Tennyson, Matthew Arnold, Swinburne, Bridges—have little in common except perhaps perfection of form, and this common element vanishes if we add the Brownings. Greek influence stimulates and inspires, yet leaves the poet free to develop his own genius with enlarged horizons and quickened sensibilities.

For the rest, the contributors, as was to be expected in such a joint enterprise, govern themselves Cyclops-fashion οὐδ' ἀλλήλων ἀλέγουσι. Only a few attempt close-packed summaries of facts. Sir T. L. Heath (author of *Aristarchus of Samos*), who writes on mathematics and astronomy (97-136), gives an admirable survey of the history of Greek geometry, but cuts off astronomy with a page. *The Natural Science* of Professor D'Arcy W. Thompson (author of

¹ The italics are Professor Carpenter's.